

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The final Office Action of December 1, 2004 has been received and contents carefully reviewed.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1 and 22-31 are currently pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,335,776); rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,724,452); and rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Patel (U.S. Patent No. 5,841,500). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...auxiliary electrode lines formed in the same layer as the gate lines." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and claims 22-31, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

It is noted that the present application is a continuation of U.S. Application No. 09/629,793, which bears a filing date of July 31, 2000. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Kim may be used to reject claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), but it may not be used to reject claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Accordingly, Applicants assume that the Examiner meant to reject claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) with Kim.

The rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Takeda et al. and the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Patel are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), subject matter developed by another person which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) shall not preclude patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103 where the subject matter in the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same persons or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. The present application and Kim were, at the time of the invention of the present application, made and owned by LG. Philips LCD Co., Ltd. Moreover, the present application was filed after November 29, 1999; and therefore prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is subject to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn as Kim is not valid prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: March 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant